

Madam Speaker, I ask that my distinguished colleagues join me recognizing the enormous contributions to the civic and cultural life of our Nation by Wilhelmina Cole Holladay, founder of the National Museum of Women in the Arts.

ENCOURAGE CITIZENS TO PARTICIPATE IN THEIR LOCAL BLOOD DRIVE

HON. TIMOTHY WALBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 2007

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, the renowned author William Shakespeare once wrote, "How far that little candle throws his beams! So shines a good deed in a weary world."

It is in that spirit of brotherly love that I come before this House to address an issue of great urgency back in my south-central Michigan district.

According to a January 28, 2007 article in the Lansing State Journal, Michigan's statewide blood inventory levels "have remained below an adequate supply for all negative blood types since early January."

The article goes on to state that a 72-hour supply of blood is typically necessary for the needs of patients in Michigan's 127 hospitals, but the inventory level of certain blood types in Michigan has dropped to just a 12- to 24-hour supply.

This past weekend I had the opportunity to participate in the St. Gerard Blood Drive held in Delta Township in Michigan's Eaton County. While I confess I have never been a fan of needles, the feeling of civic duty experienced by myself and all the donors that day far outweighed any temporary pain we may have felt as a result of a needle.

It's said that a faithful friend is the medicine of life, and I urge my fellow Michiganders and Americans across this great country to heed the call of organizations like the Red Cross and make an appointment at your local blood donation center.

HONORING ORTHODONTISTS

HON. WM. LACY CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 2007

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Orthodontists everywhere by introducing a Resolution to establish a National Orthodontic Health Month. Since the early 1900s, the specialty of orthodontics has been a growing part of our Nation's dental health system. This resolution expresses the sense of Congress that U.S. citizens should observe a National Orthodontic Health Month to recognize the advancing art and science of orthodontics. In addition, this Resolution aims to encourage Americans to learn more about the benefit of quality orthodontic care.

Over 5 million citizens of all ages are currently undergoing orthodontic treatment. An attractive smile contributes to self-esteem and self-image, improving a person's self-confidence and contributing to both social and career success. An attractive smile simply

makes people more comfortable and more willing to open up to the world around them.

I have been impressed by the impact that orthodontists have not only on their patients, but also the communities in which they serve. Orthodontists are truly dental specialists, undergoing years of training to learn how to safely and effectively correct misaligned jaws and teeth. In addition, orthodontists donate over 62 million dollars worth of pro-bono dental services each year.

The American Association of Orthodontists is the leading voice for orthodontists in this country. The organization represents almost 95 percent of American orthodontists and is dedicated to maintaining the high quality of orthodontic care and promoting advances in orthodontic treatment and technology. I am proud that the American Association of Orthodontists is headquartered within my district in St. Louis, Missouri and I wholeheartedly support efforts to publicize the benefits of orthodontic treatment and the practice of orthodontics.

Madam Speaker, it is with great privilege that I recognize orthodontists today before Congress and I urge my colleagues to join me in working to establish a National Orthodontic Health Month. I myself can attest to the positive benefits of orthodontic care, as I have become one of the millions of adults who use braces to improve my oral health. By establishing a National Orthodontic Health Month we are taking a big first step towards educating people about the importance of orthodontic care as part of their overall oral health.

"DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR THE INDEFENSIBLE"

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 2007

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, earlier this session I inserted into the RECORD a cogent editorial from the Boston Globe calling for the dismissal of Deputy Assistant Secretary Charles Stimson, who outrageously urged corporations in America to boycott attorneys who performed their duty as lawyers in defending people accused of violating the law who were incarcerated in Guantanamo. While Mr. Stimson has since been forced to apologize, the apology was an entirely unconvincing one, in which he claimed not to have meant what he clearly said. A recent article in The Washington Post by the very able writer Richard Cohen correctly questions the apology, makes clear once again how wildly outrageous Mr. Stimson's comments were, and concludes correctly that "his words show that he is unfit for government service. . ." I ask that Mr. Cohen's thoughtful column be printed here because it is our responsibility as elected officials to continue to protest Mr. Stimson's presence in our Government, particularly in a position where he should be advocating policies exactly the opposite of his call for the boycott of conscientious and courageous attorneys.

DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR THE INDEFENSIBLE

(By Richard Cohen)

"On the cold moonlit evening of March 5, 1770," writes David McCullough in his mag-

isterial "John Adams," "the streets of Boston were covered by nearly a foot of snow." A crowd set upon a lone British sentry at Boston's Province House, taunting him. Quickly, reinforcements arrived, and so did a larger crowd. Soon the crowd hurled snowballs, chunks of ice, oyster shells and stones. The soldiers, now nine, opened fire, killing five Bostonians—"bloody butchery," Samuel Adams called it. Only one lawyer would defend the British soldiers. He was a different Adams—John Adams, a good man on the path to being great.

I resurrect this tale about Adams because it is sorely needed. Just this month, an official in the Bush administration, a deputy assistant secretary of defense named Charles D. Stimson, suggested that lawyers who defend terrorism suspects being held at Guantanamo not only should not do so but that their firms ought to be blackballed as a result.

"I think, quite honestly, when corporate CEOs see that those firms are representing the very terrorists who hit their bottom line back in 2001, those CEOs are going to make those law firms choose between representing terrorists or representing reputable firms," he said in a radio interview. You may want to read that again.

It's hard to know where to begin. Shall it be with the notion that the Sept. 11 terrorists did not so much murder about 3,000 people as hit the "bottom line" of American corporations? This is a stunningly original take on that awful day, an auditor's reading of history that Stimson, in the spare time he deserves to have in abundance, might want to apply to the bombing of Pearl Harbor or the burning of Atlanta. I doubt that any CEO look at Sept. 11 as a bad day at the office.

More to the point, what sort of lawyer— and Stimson is one—not only thinks that a terrorism suspect does not deserve counsel but that the counsel ought to be punished as a result? It's hard to fathom a lawyer saying such a thing—even hard to fathom it from a mere citizen.

It would be just a waste of my time, I suppose, to point out that the Guantanamo suspects are just suspects, convicted so far of nothing. In fact, some of them have been released and others, arrested and held elsewhere, turned out to not be the mass murderers and master criminals the government, in a fit of hype, originally accused them of being. Anyone who thinks all prosecutors speak nothing but the truth need only familiarize themselves with the case of the lacrosse players at Duke. There's a sad lesson in American jurisprudence for you.

Naturally enough, Stimson's repudiation of everything John Adams stood for produced some protest, condemnation and outrage. Following the well-established Washington rule, Stimson apologized, doing so in a letter to The Post. He said his remarks did not reflect his "core beliefs." He did not blame his utterance on drugs, booze, Twinkies or a deep depression; he merely said that his words had left the wrong "impression." With that, he has returned to the obscurity from whence he came, his job presumably secure.

I, for one, do not accept Stimson's apology. I think it is insincerely offered and beside the point. What matters most is that he retains his job, which means he retains the confidence of his superiors in the government. How anyone can have confidence in such a man is beyond me. There are only two explanations, one inexcusable, the other chilling. The first is that his bosses don't care. The second is that they agree with him.

I would guess that Stimson strongly felt it was No. 2—agreement. From the get-go, the Bush administration has taken the position that anyone it detained on terrorism charges